

Appl. No. 09/603,356

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Former claim 34 was directed to "a computer data signal embodied in a transmission medium". According to page 3 of the Office Action, a signal does not fall within the realm of statutory subject matter.

Applicant submits that this subject matter has been recognized by the Patent Office as an article of manufacture under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claim 34, both in its original form and as amended in the above listing of claims, recites a specific article of manufacture embodied on a computer-readable medium, namely the recited transmission medium.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 are thus respectfully requested.

Turning now to the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103, claims 1 to 5, 7 to 11, 13 to 17, 24, 26, and 31 to 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft ("Single Sign-On in Windows 2000 Networks"), in view of Gadi (United States Patent No. 6,629,246). Of the remaining claims, claims 18 to 23, 25, 27 to 30, and 35 are allowed, and claims 6 and 12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, as indicated on page 9 of the Office Action.

Claim 1 has been cancelled, and claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of former claim 1, and accordingly is now allowable. Dependent claims 2 to 5, 7 to 10, 24, and 26 now depend from allowable claim 6 and thus are also allowable.

Claim 11 has been cancelled and claim 12 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1 and intervening claim 11. Claim 12 as amended is therefore allowable.

Claim 13 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 18, and accordingly is also believed to be allowable. Claims 14, 15, and 17 depend from claim 13, and thus now ultimately depend from allowable claim 18 and are believed to be allowable.

Appl. No. 09/603,356

Both claims 31 and 34 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable claim 18, and therefore are allowable for the same reasons as claim 18. Claims 32 and 33 depend from allowable claim 31 and therefore are also allowable.

In summary, claims 2 to 10 and 12 to 35 remain in the application. Claims 2 to 10, 12 to 15, and 17 to 35 were either allowed or amended to include limitations from an allowable claim or to depend from an allowable claim. Accordingly, it is believed that the remarks made on pages 3 to 9 of the Office Action need not be specifically addressed in respect of these claims, as each claim incorporates subject matter which has been acknowledged to be allowable. This should not be interpreted in any way as an acquiescence to the remarks in the Office Action or the interpretations of the cited references presented therein. Claim 16 is the only remaining claim which includes subject matter that has not previously been indicated by the Examiner to be allowable. Accordingly, the remarks below address only the statements in the Office Action which were made in respect of claim 16.

Considering now claim 16 as amended, claim 16 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of claim 1 and claim 11.

In respect of claim 1, the Office Action acknowledges that the Microsoft document discloses that devices controlling access to a resource and the resource itself are on different computers, and fails to disclose the claimed limitation that "at least part of the access control information is used to control access to a protected resource of at least one of the first and second network devices". The Office Action then points to Gadi as allegedly disclosing this feature.

Although Gadi may well disclose a single sign-on network system in which a web server controls access to a resource which is on the server itself, it is respectfully submitted that it would not be obvious to a person skilled in the art to combine the teachings of the Microsoft reference with those of Gadi.

For example, Gadi deals with protecting different site-specific passwords with a separate "master" password, which is a significantly different scheme than is used in the Kerberos protocol described in the Microsoft reference.

Appl. No. 09/603,356

Further, Kerberos is a centralized authentication protocol. A user authenticates with a Key Distribution Center (KDC) which provides service tickets to be used in accessing resources within a particular realm or domain. KDCs are not intended to host or provide resources, and instead are involved only in accessing resources on other devices. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that including both KDC functionality and network resource functionality in the same computer would be contrary to the primary goal of Kerberos, namely providing centralized authentication for resources on other separate servers.

On page 8 of the Office Action, in considering claim 16, it is stated that the Microsoft reference discloses that the user must supply a password to begin the session. This, however, is not equivalent to requiring user acceptance before including the at least part of the user-specific information in the second message, as recited in claim 16. The function of requiring user acceptance provides a user with control over the user-specific information which is included in the second message. Thus, the invention as defined in claim 16 gives the user the opportunity to give acceptance before user-specific information is passed from one domain to another. The password used in Kerberos to initially establish a session is not related at all to providing the user with the opportunity to accept or reject the information that is passed from one domain to another through the end user device.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. The cited references do not disclose all of the limitations of claim 16, and additionally a person skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of the Microsoft reference and Gadi in the manner suggested by the Office Action. Combining KDC functionality and network resource functionality into a single network device, as suggested in the Office Action, would also be contrary to primary intended purposes and functions of the Kerberos protocol and the teachings of the Microsoft reference.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness objection to claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are therefore respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/603,356

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all of the claims remaining in the application are allowable, Applicant solicits early consideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

RAY C. H. CHENG

By


Allan Brett

Reg. No. 40,476

Tel.: (613) 232-2486 ext. 323

Date: September 19, 2005

RAB:DMW:acb:rld